DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 350 642 CS 507 993

AUTHOR Morreale, Sherwyn P.; And Others
TITLE The Center for Excellence in Oral Communication: A Comprehensive Program for Assessing the Development of Public Speaking Competency.
PUB DATE Oct 92
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (78th, Chicago, IL, October 29-November 1, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; *Competency Based Education; Course Descriptions; Course Objectives; Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; Introductory Courses; *Public Speaking; Speech Instruction; *Student Evaluation; Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS *University of Colorado Colorado Springs

ABSTRACT

This paper describes a comprehensive assessment program utilized in the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs' basic public speaking course, The Speech and Thought Curriculum. The paper begins with a description of the theoretical underpinnings of the course and its approach to assessment. Next, the paper outlines the competency objectives (subsuming cognition, behaviors, affect, and ethics) incorporated in the course. Then the paper describes the course's process for pre- and post-assessment interviews, along with the competency-based approach to evaluating classroom speaking performances. The paper concludes with a discussion of future directions for assessment in the course. (Three tables of data are included; 25 references, the competent speaker speech performance evaluation form, and the syllabus are attached.) (Author/RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED350642

The Center for Excellence in Oral Communication: A Comprehensive Program for Assessing the Development of Public Speaking Competency

Sherwyn P. Morreale, Ph.D.

Penny Whitney, M.A., Beth Zautke, M.A., Kathleen Ellis,
Colleen McCormick, Stephen Witter,

University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80933-7150
719-593-3644

A Paper Presented to the Seventy-Eighth
Annual Meeting of the
Speech Communication Association
October 29-November 1, 1992
Chicago, Illinois

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Sherwyn P. Morreale
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS507953

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

As issues related to evaluation and accountability have emerged within the academic community, assessment in the basic public speaking course has become more important. The Center for Excellence in Oral Communication at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs has begun to address those issues. This paper describes a comprehensive assessment program utilized in the University's basic public speaking course, The Speech and Thought Curriculum. The paper begins with a description of the theoretical underpinnings of the course and its approach to assessment. Next, the competency objectives (subsuming cognition, behaviors, affect, and ethics) incorporated in the course are outlined. Then the course's process for pre- and post-assessment interviews is described, along with the competency-based approach to evaluating classroom speaking performances. The paper concludes with a discussion of future directions for assessment in this course.

The Center for Excellence in Oral Communication: A Comprehensive Program for Assessing the Development of Public Speaking Competency

As issues related to accountability and assessment have gained in importance for educators and administrators, the assessment of oral communication competency has become increasingly important (Cronin, 1992). A recent survey of regional accrediting agencies' requirements for oral communication competencies in higher education called attention to this concern (Chesebro, 1991). That survey indicated that colleges and universities seeking accreditation in the south, west, or middle states' regions must meet the goals and/or requirements of accrediting agencies to ensure that their students achieve meaningful levels of competency as oral communicators. "The handwriting is on the wall!" Or more appropriately, "The word is out!" Speech communication professionals, both educators and administrators, must attend with diligence to the assessment of oral communication competency in general, and to public speaking in particular.

The present paper describes an assessment program in an undergraduate public speaking course, The Speech and Thought Curriculum. That course, presently offered at University of Colorado at Colorado Springs, was modeled after a similar course developed by the nationally recognized scholar of public speaking, Dr. Frank Dance at the University of Denver. The paper begins with an overview of The Speech and Thought Curriculum, including a

description of its theoretical base and course objectives. Then the course approach to pre- and post-assessment of oral communication competency is described. The statistical results of a pre- and post-interview process in the course are presented and discussed. Included in those data are the results of the assessment of students' competencies related to speaking, listening, interpersonal skills, communication apprehension, and self-esteem. Next, a competency-based approach to the in-class evaluation of public speaking performance is described. The paper concludes with a discussion of the faculty's future plans for continued development and refinement of the course's assessment process.

THE SPEECH AND THOUGHT CURRICULUM

The current focus on oral communication competency by many scholars supports the inclusion of that construct in the instruction of public speaking (Backlund,1990; Littlejohn & Jabusch, 1982; McCroskey, 1982; Pearson & Daniels, 1988; Rubin & Henzel, 1984; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1989; Weimann & Backlund, 1980). Empirical research has also consistently related academic and professional success to oral competency and communication training and development (Curtis, Winsor, & Stephens, 1989; Rubin & Graham, 1988; Rubin, Graham, & Mignerev, 1990; Vangelisti & Daly, 1989). Additionally, Vygotsky (1986) presents a theoretical argument that educated people must be orally competent, not simply because oral competency is necessary for success in life, but more fundamentally because improved oral competency develops intellectual and

reasoning abilities.

Obviously, the development of oral competency is important but should go beyond the mere improvement of fundamental public speaking performance and oral skills. In a public speaking course, emphasis should also be on the development of thinking in an organized and logical manner, and communicating such organized thought to others.

The Speech and Thought Curriculum assists in developing the ability to communicate organized thoughts through speech. The structure and content of the Curriculum are driven by and grounded in four domains of communication competency that emphasize cognition as well as performance. The literature on communication competency suggests that a composite model of competence should focus on: (a) a cognitive domain subsuming knowledge and understanding of the communication process and the elements involved in a communication event; (b) a behavioral domain subsuming abilities possessed by the communicator and skills or behaviors emitted or observed; (c) an affective domain subsuming the communicator's feelings, attitudes, motivation, and willingness to communicate; and (d) an ethical domain subsuming the communicator's ability and willingness to take moral responsibility for the outcome of the communication event and its impact on the communicators.

Achievement for students in the Speech and Thought Curriculum is centered in these four identified domains of communication competency combined with a focus on speech and thought (see

Appendix: Course Syllabus.) The interrelation of speech and thought is examined theoretically in the lectures and applied practically in recitation sections, through performance. Students actively engage in researching, organizing, and outlining prior to speaking, then they learn to speak publicly in a more organized and logical manner.

ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT COMPETENCY IN THE LABORATORY

The Speech and Thought Curriculum involves student participation in both entrance (pre-) and exit (post-) interviews in the Center for Excellence in Oral Communication (Center) laboratory. These one-hour interviews are conducted by a staff of graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) trained to administer assessment instruments to students. The focus of the interviews is on the development and assessment of oral communication competency. The instruments administered to all students in both the pre- and post-interviews are the Communication Competency Assessment Instrument (CCAI) (Rubin, 1982), the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24) (McCroskey, 1970), and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE) (Rosenberg, 1965). Students establish personal goals in the pre-interview and review the goals in the post-interview.

The CCAI, administered one-on-one by the GTA to the student, assesses communication competency in the areas of public speaking, listening, and interpersonal communication skills. If an analysis of the CCAI scores indicates that the student requires further guidance in any area, the GTA is trained to direct and coordinate

follow-up assistance.

The PRCA-24 is designed to assess levels of communication apprehension. This diagnostic instrument explores apprehension in meetings, groups, conversations, and public speaking contexts. Students with higher than average levels of communication apprehension are encouraged to seek help in Individual Assistance Programs available in a laboratory setting.

The RSE assesses the self-esteem level of the student. If the score derived from this diagnostic tool reflects a low self-esteem, the student is referred to other student support services on campus.

For purposes of consistency, the same GTA conducts the pre- and post-interviews with the same student. Pre-test scores are used to indicate strengths and weaknesses the student should consider during the course. At the conclusion of the course, based on pre/post differences in scores, progress and plans for future development of communication competencies are discussed.

RESULTS OF THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS

The assessment and demographic data collected during the entrance and exit interviews are entered into a database connected to the University's mainframe; those data then are statistically analyzed. Results of the data analysis process are carefully reviewed by faculty to advise students and to redirect course content and pedagogy. Typical results of the assessment process in the public speaking course for one academic year are reported

in Tables 1, 2, and 3.

Insert Tables 1, 2, and 3 About Here

Table 1 presents the results of pre- and post-testing of all students enrolled in the Speech and Though Curriculum during 1991-1992. Results indicate that students made significant improvement in all areas assessed. As expected, the most pronounced gains occurred in public speaking competency and reduction of public speaking apprehension. Gains also were noted in overall competency (an average gain of 8.51 points) and overall reduction of communication apprehension (an average drop of 11.33 points).

Although reduction in all areas of apprehension was significant, less reduction occurred in the group context. To address this issue, pedagogy is currently being revised to include more opportunities for group discussion and small group work in the large lecture sections and in the small recitation sections.

Tables 2 and 3 compare pre- and post-scores for the CCAI, PRCA-24, and self-esteem by ethnicity and gender. No gender differences were apparent. In regard to ethnicity, however, some differences appeared to exist. Although overall improvement of the Non-White population as a group was positive, results suggest that more attention may need to be directed toward Black, Asian, and American Indian populations; but obviously, the sample sizes for non-White students is too small to be considered significant. As the sample size of ethnically diverse students becomes larger,

Center faculty will continue to monitor student progress and to refine programs and curricula to better meet the needs of all students. In addition, since data analysis demonstrated that gains in listening competency, though significant, were smaller than gains in other areas for all students, an in-class assessment component aimed at the development of critical listening skills has been added to the course curriculum.

IN-CLASS SPEECH EVALUATION: A COMPETENCY-BASED APPROACH

After the students have undergone pre-course assessment in the Speech and Thought Curriculum, they prepare and present five speeches. Students enrolled in the course are encouraged to consider carefully the fact that their speeches, specifically when delivered to a group, represent their thoughts. They are challenged to think before they speak. Early in the course, a videotaped lecture by Dr. Frank Dance is shown to the students to provide a theoretical framework for their development of speech and thought in the classroom speeches (Dance, 1990).

Building upon this foundation, the students are instructed in the use of The Competent Speaker Evaluation Form (CSEF). The CSEF provides the paradigmatic structure for the course, which enables students to develop their public speaking abilities by strengthening the relationship between their speech and their thoughts. The speech evaluation form contains eight public speaking competencies that are divided into two sections (see Appendix: Competent Speaker Evaluation Form.)

The first four competencies represent abilities related to the

preparation of thoughts for presentation: the reasoned choosing of a topic, limiting and focusing that topic with an appropriate thesis, organizing subordinate ideas, and developing supporting ideas. The last four competencies represent the presentation of the ideas in terms of style and delivery. These competencies involve: the use of language and vocalics, correct pronunciation and articulation of words, and appropriate bodily behaviors during the speech. Use of the CSEF is intended to motivate the students in the Speech and Thought Curriculum to evaluate carefully their thoughts and words. And, since this form is used for evaluative purposes, students know exactly what is expected of their classroom speeches.

This instrument was developed in response to a charge given to a task force of conference participants of the 1990 Summer Conference on the Assessment of Oral Communication Competency (Backlund, 1990). Although multiple instruments have been developed and are available to evaluate performance in public speaking, this instrument was anchored in the communication literature regarding competent public speaking (Communication Competency Assessment Instrument (Rubin, 1982); Speaking and Listening Competencies for High School Graduates (1982); Wingspread Conference Proceedings: Essential College Sophomore Speaking and Listening Competencies (Quianthy, 1990). Additionally, the instrument has been tested for its psychometric reliability and validity (Morreale, 1992).

Based on a review of the public speaking competency

literature, the Speech Communication Association (SCA) task force at the 1990 Summer Conference developed the CSEF. That subcommittee of the SCA Committee on Assessment and Testing was comprised of scholars from 11 universitie who endeavored to construct an instrument that would effectively evaluate overall public speaking competency. The committee members decided that the greatest need was for an instrument that would be used for two fundamental purposes: (a) the evaluation and subsequent development of public speaking competencies in public speaking students, and (b) pre- and/or post-assessment of these same competencies in students considering and/or taking basic public speaking courses. Furthermore, the subcommittee decided that this instrument should be developed for the college sophomore level (grade 14). After extensively reviewing the above mentioned literature, two documents were selected as most germane to the construction of an assessment instrument for public speaking. These were SCA's Speaking and Listening Competencies for High School Graduates (1982) and Communication is Life: Essential College Sophomore Speaking and Listening Competencies (Quianthy, 1990).

The public speaking competencies listed in the college sophomore document were carefully compared to those spelled out in the high school document, and a list of public speaking competencies emerged. Following this procedure, this list was critically compared to the seven public speaking items within the CCAI (Rubin, 1982). Once the subcommittee members were satisfied

that the resultant list of competencies represented the most current and best thought in this area, the committee reworded the individual competencies to insure clear language and consistent structure. Thus the eight statements of public speaking competency that comprise the CSEF were developed. Following this development, the committee generated standards of performance (criteria) relative to each competency by which a speaker's competencies could be evaluated. The task force next constructed the form in which these eight competencies would be placed (Morreale, 1990). SCA guidelines for the development of such a form were adhered to, and special emphasis was placed on control of rater errors and appropriate scale construction (Bock & Bock, 1981). Also, the National College Board directives for the construction of speaking and listening measures were followed (Powers, 1984). Moreover, this instrument was made to conform to the policy statement developed at the 1990 SCA Summer Conference on the Assessment of Oral Communication, SCA Policy on Criteria for the Assessment of Oral Communication (Crocker-Lakness, 1991).

As mentioned earlier, the CSEF is used in the Speech and Thought Curriculum. Inter-rater reliability in the use of this form by multiple evaluators of different sections of the course is achieved through training and dialogue on issues critical to this concern. Each of the graduate assistants who uses this form to evaluate public speaking students is required to participate in group training for proper use of the form. During this training, the trainee raters are asked to review the eight competencies and

the descriptive criteria before viewing speeches. Following this, they view 12 exemplary speeches, some excellent, some satisfactory, and some unsatisfactory with respect to the criteria for the eight competencies. Subsequent to the viewing of each speech, the trainees compare their evaluations. In this way the trainees develop a fuller understanding of the competencies and potential applications to multiple speeches. Brief comparative evaluations are repeated throughout the semester. In these ways inter-rater reliability has been achieved and maintained among the evaluators in the course.

CONCLUSION

Communication Department faculty involved in The Speech and Thought Curriculum believe there are significant advantages to the approach taken to assessment in the course. The benefits and positive impact of assessment, on behalf of undergraduate students, are notable. Assessment has proven valuable in regard to (a) student advisement, (b) redirecting course content and pedagogy, and (c) addressing issues related to accountability and--indirectly--accreditation.

Student advisement is provided in the entrance interview because the results of the pre-assessment process are used to discuss the student's strengths and weaknesses and to provide appropriate supporting materials and activities. In the exit interview, the comparison of pre- and post-scores on assessment instruments provides a vivid illustration to the student of progress achieved in the course.

Course content and pedagogical approaches to teaching the course are reviewed and revised based on the results of the assessment process. For example, if many students fail to demonstrate significant improvement in listening skills or in communication apprehension, then appropriate redirection of course content and/or pedagogy is in order. Or, if a significant number of any particular segment of the student population, based on gender, ethnicity, age, etc., demonstrates a need for more support or direction in any area of competency, that support can be provided to that population. Course instructors can pay more attention to a particular student population regarding any dimension of communication competency that the assessment process identifies as in need of support.

Accountability, and in some cases accreditation, is addressed through the assessment process in the course. Significant improvement between pre- and post-interview scores and tests present a verifiable case for the impact of the course on students. Statistical analyses of the assessment data, by ethnicity, gender, or for the total student population in the course, can furnish an analytical picture for accreditation agencies of the course's impact on students.

These three benefits of assessment aside, communication faculty intend to continue to explore "variations on the assessment theme." The use of a pre- and post-assessment process in a basic public speaking course is new. Faculty intend to monitor and revise the assessment approach being taken in The Speech and

Thought Curriculum. Any instruments used or data generated through pre- and post-assessment that fail to prove valuable to students or to faculty will be discontinued. Any additional instruments or assessment procedures that may need to be pilot-tested and incorporated into the assessment process will be considered. The raison d'etre for assessing students is twofold: to advise students effectively and to evaluate course content and pedagogy. Given such reasons, the assessment program will be monitored by Communication Department faculty, and the results of the program will be shared with other communication professionals interested in developing similar assessment programs for their public speaking courses.

References

Backlund, P. (1990). SCA Conference on Assessment of Communication Competency. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Bock, D. G., & Bock, E. H. (1981). Evaluating classroom speaking. Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Chesebro, J. (1991). Oral communication competency and assessment as a component of college and university accreditation. The Carolinas Speech Communication Annual, 7, 7-22.

Crocker-Lakness, J., et al. (1991). SCA policy on criteria for the assessment of oral communication. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Cronin, M. (1992). Accreditation standards for oral communication competency. Paper presented at the 78th meeting of the Speech Communication Association. Chicago, IL.

Curtis, D., Winsor, J., & Stephens, R. (1989). National preferences in business and communication education. Communication, 38, 6-14.

Dance, F. (1990). Lecture presented at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs.

Littlejohn, S. W., & Jabusch, D. M. (1982). Communication competence: Model and application. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 10, 29-37.

McCroskey, J.C. (1970). Measure of communication-bound anxiety. Speech Monographs, 37, 269-277.

McCroskey, J. C. (1982). Communication competence and performance: A research and pedagogical perspective. Communication Education, 13, 2-7.

Morreale, S. (1990, November). "The competent speaker": Development of a communication-competency based speech evaluation form and manual. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 325 901)

Morreale, S., et al. (1992). "The competent speaker" speech evaluation form. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Pearson, J. C., & Daniels, T. D. (1988). Oh, what tangled webs we weave: Concerns about current conceptions of communication competence. Communication Reports, 1, 95-100.

Powers, D. E. (1984). Considerations for developing measures of speaking and listening. College Board Report No. 84-5. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Quianthy, R. L. (1990). Communication is life: Essential college sophomore speaking and listening competencies. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rubin, R. B. (1982a). Assessing speaking and listening competence at the college level: The communication competency assessment instrument. Communication Education, 31, 19-32

Rubin, R. B. (1982b). Communication competency assessment instrument. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Rubin, R., & Graham, E. (1988). Correlates of college success. Communication Education, 37, 14-27.

Rubin, R., Graham, E., & Mignerey, J. (1990). A longitudinal study of college students' communication competence. Communication Education, 39, 1-13.

Rubin, R. B., & Henzel, S. A. (1984). Cognitive complexity, communication competence and verbal ability. Communication Quarterly, 32, 263-270.

Speaking and listening competencies for high school graduates. (1982). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (1989). Handbook of interpersonal competence research. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Vangelisti, A., & Daly, J. (1989). Correlates of speaking skills in the United States: A national assessment. Communication Education, 38, 132-143.

Vygotsky, L. (1986). Thought and language (A. Kozulin. Trans.). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Weimann, J. M., & Backlund, P. (1980). Current theory and research in communicative competence. Review of Educational Research, 50, 185-199.

Table 1:
T-Tests Comparing 1991-1992 Pre- and Post-Scores for Communication Competency Assessment Instrument[3] (CCAI), Personal Report of Communication Apprehension[1] (PRCA), and Self-Esteem[2].

Assessment Instrument	N	Mean	Std Dev	t Value	2-Tail Prob
CCAI Speaking	224			-13.70***	.000
Pre		26.92	4.34		
Post		30.88	3.18		
CCAI Interpersonal	222			-8.45***	.000
Pre		32.06	4.17		
Post		34.72	4.47		
CCAI Listening	224			-8.26***	.000
Pre		14.57	3.05		
Post		16.49	2.51		
CCAI Overall Comm	217			-12.38***	.000
Pre		72.73	9.40		
Post		81.24	8.00		
PRCA Group	225			3.53**	.001
Pre		14.62	4.87		
Post		13.20	5.98		
PRCA Meeting	225			7.09***	.000
Pre		16.01	5.06		
Post		13.92	4.36		
PRCA Conversation	225			7.77***	.000
Pre		14.25	4.03		
Post		12.25	4.41		
PRCA Public Speaking	225			16.41***	.000
Pre		20.60	4.99		
Post		15.66	4.23		
PRCA Overall Comm App	224			13.62***	.000
Pre		65.80	15.52		
Post		54.47	13.43		
Self-Esteem	144			-7.04***	.000
Pre		32.17	4.86		
Post		34.35	4.00		

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

Note: An increase in scores on the CCAI and the Self-Esteem is positive and shows improvement, whereas a decrease in scores on the PRCA is positive and shows improvement.

Table 2:
T-Tests, by ETHNICITY, Comparing 1991-1992 Pre- and Post-Scores for Communication Competency Assessment Instrument[3] (CCAI), Personal Report of Communication Apprehension[1] (PRCA), and Self-Esteem[2].

Assessment Instrument	N	Mean	Std Dev	t Value	2-Tail Prob
CCAI Overall					
Anglo	182			-11.11***	.000
Pre		72.98	9.08		
Post		81.49	7.97		
Black	9			-1.70	.127
Pre		75.89	9.68		
Post		79.67	6.98		
Hispanic	13			-3.68**	.003
Pre		68.92	9.23		
Post		77.85	7.89		
Asian	8			-3.63**	.008
Pre		70.25	14.84		
Post		79.88	10.90		
American Indian	4			-1.95	.146
Pre		70.00	11.80		
Post		85.25	3.95		
PRCA Overall					
Anglo	187			12.30***	.000
Pre		65.24	15.53		
Post		54.06	13.08		
Black	9			2.82*	.022
Pre		65.56	17.42		
Post		54.11	16.37		
Hispanic	14			4.90***	.000
Pre		70.43	14.24		
Post		56.07	13.56		
Asian	8			1.73	.128
Pre		75.25	14.66		
Post		64.00	9.46		
American Indian	5			3.86*	.018
Pre		55.20	8.29		
Post		43.40	10.64		

Table 2 (continued)

Assessment Instrument	N	Mean	Std Dev	t Value	2-Tail Prob
Self-Esteem Overall					
Anglo	121			-7.32***	.000
Pre		31.87	4.88		
Post		34.36	4.09		
Black	3			-.19	.868
Pre		33.33	3.51		
Post		33.67	4.04		
Hispanic	9			-1.83	.105
Pre		32.78	5.31		
Post		34.67	3.50		
Asian	7			.15	.884
Pre		32.57	4.08		
Post		32.43	2.70		
American Indian	4			.63	.572
Pre		38.25	1.26		
Post		37.00	4.24		

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

Note: An increase in scores on the CCAI and the Self-Esteem is positive and shows improvement, whereas a decrease in scores on the PRCA is positive and shows improvement.

Table 3:
T-Tests, by GENDER, Comparing 1991-1992 Pre- and Post-Scores for Communication Competency Assessment Instrument[1] (CCAI), Personal Report of Communication Apprehension[1] (PRCA), and Self-Esteem[2].

Assessment Instrument	N	Mean	Std Dev	t Value	2-Tail Prob
CCAI Overall					
Females	136			-10.94***	.000
Pre		72.13	8.82		
Post		81.27	8.26		
Males	81			-6.26***	.000
Pre		73.74	10.28		
Post		81.18	7.60		
PRCA Overall					
Females	139			11.36***	.000
Pre		66.65	15.53		
Post		55.06	14.21		
Males	85			7.64***	.000
Pre		64.40	15.48		
Post		53.52	12.07		
Self-Esteem Overall					
Females	87			-6.28***	.000
Pre		31.46	4.90		
Post		34.00	4.25		
Males	57			-3.42**	.001
Pre		33.25	4.63		
Post		34.88	3.56		

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

Note: An increase in scores on the CCAI and the Self-Esteem is positive and shows improvement, whereas a decrease in scores on the PRCA is positive and shows improvement.

THE COMPETENT SPEAKER
SPEECH PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM

SPEAKER'S NAME:_____ ASSIGNMENT:_____
EVALUATOR'S NAME:_____ DATE:__/__/__

EIGHT PUBLIC SPEAKING COMPETENCIES	SPEAKING PERFORMANCE RATINGS		
System for Scoring:	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent
Competency One CHOOSES AND NARROWS A TOPIC APPROPRIATELY FOR THE AUDIENCE AND OCCASION Comments:			
Competency Two COMMUNICATES THE THESIS/SPECIFIC PURPOSE IN A MANNER APPROPRIATE FOR AUDIENCE AND OCCASION Comments:			
Competency Three PROVIDES APPROPRIATE SUPPORTING MATERIAL BASED ON THE AUDIENCE AND OCCASION Comments:			
Competency Four USES AN ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERN APPROPRIATE TO TOPIC, AUDIENCE, OCCASION, & PURPOSE Comments:			
Competency Five USES LANGUAGE THAT IS APPROPRIATE TO THE AUDIENCE AND OCCASION Comments:			
Competency Six USES VOCAL VARIETY IN RATE, PITCH, & INTENSITY, TO HEIGHTEN AND MAINTAIN INTEREST Comments:			
Competency Seven USES PRONUNCIATION, GRAMMAR, & ARTICULATION APPROPRIATE TO THE DESIGNATED AUDIENCE Comments:			
Competency Eight USES PHYSICAL BEHAVIORS THAT SUPPORT THE VERBAL MESSAGE Comments:			

General Comments:

Summative Score of Competencies:_____

' 1990. Dr. Sherwyn Morreale and SCA/CAT Subcommittee

Comm 210: SPEECH AND THOUGHT CURRICULUM
SYLLABUS, FALL, 1992

Lectures: Tuesday, 4:30-5:45 pm MH 412 & Thursday, 1:40-2:55 pm MH 414

Sherwyn Morreale
MH 413, Ext. 644
Individual Assistance Lab. 593-3218

Recitation Sections: Tuesday, 5:50-7:05 pm
Thursday, 3:05-4:20 pm

Recitation Instructor: _____

Emergency Messages: _____

Emergency Messages: 593-3137

DATE	LECTURE	RECITATION	CHAPTER READINGS
*NOTE: Entrance interview must be done within weeks 1 & 2.			
Aug 25 Aug 27	Course Overview and Requirements; Definitions	Get acquainted *Introductory Speech (2 minutes)	1,17
Sept 1 Sept 3	Oral Comm.Competency: Four Components and Eight Competencies	Course Philosophy: The Relationship of Speech and Thought	2,5
Sept 15 Sept 17	Organizing and Outlining	Organizing and outlining exercise	10,13
Sept 22 Sept 24	Listening and Public Speaking	*Informative Speech (4 minutes) *Inf. Sp. Outline	3
Sept 29 Oct 1	Communication Apprehension: Causes and Cures	*Informative Speech (4 minutes) *Inf. Sp. Outline	
Oct 6 Oct 8	Researching the Speech Causes and Cures	Library tour	6,7
Oct 13 Oct 15	Speech Presentation: Verbal Factors	Using speech aids	8,11
Oct 20 Oct 22	Speech Presentation: Nonverbal Factors	*Documentative/ Speech Aids Speech (6 minutes) *Doc. Sp. Outline	12

Oct 27 Oct 29	Persuasion: Audience Analysis and Persuasive Techniques	*Documentative/ Speech Aids Speech (6 minutes) *Doc. Sp. Outline	14,15
Nov 3 Nov 5	Persuasion: Structuring the Message	Working session and practice speeches using the Motivated Sequence	
Nov 10 Nov 12	Persuasion: Theory and Research	*Persuasive Speech (6 minutes)	
Nov 17 Nov 19	Ethics and Public Speaking	*Persuasive Speech (6 minutes)	
Nov 24 Nov 26	Thanksgiving Break (No lecture)	No Recitation	
Dec 1 Dec 3	Rhetoric: A Historical Perspective on Pub. Spking.	*Oral Final Practice Session	

*NOTE: Exit interviews must be done during weeks 15 & 16

Dec 8 Dec 10	Evaluation of Great Speeches: Your Turn to Grade!	*Oral Final Presentation (8 minutes)
Dec 15 Dec 17	How Far Have We Come? *Ethics Statements; Course Evaluations; Cookies & Milk	*Oral Final Presentation (8 minutes)

I. <u>SUMMARY OF STUDENT REQUIREMENTS (These are items with an * beside them.)</u>

1. Entrance and Exit Interview (setting personal behavioral goals and assessing speaking and listening competencies, communication apprehension, and self esteem).

2. Four Outlines for Speeches (typed in duplicate).

3. Five In-Class Presentations.

4. Five Viewings of videotaped Presentations in the Individual Assistance Laboratory within two weeks of each presentation (except the Oral Final Presentation which must be viewed by the end of the semester).

5. Statement of Personal Ethics (regarding public/presentational speaking and communication competency).

.. Oral Final Exam (covering lecture and textbook material).

II. SPECIFIC GUIDELINES ON COURSE POLICY

All course work, including outlines and presentations, is due and/or must be presented on the assigned day and time. Failure to complete any course assignment on the day and time due will result in an automatic halving of the grade for the assignment (as the highest possible score). Exceptions to this policy will only be negotiated on an individual basis and will be subject to the approval of Center faculty.

III. SPEECH AND THOUGHT CURRICULUM: GRADING AND SPECIFIC GUIDELINES

A. COGNITIVE DOMAIN: (knowing)

The student will be able to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the theories and concepts related to academic inquiry and study in the areas of speech and thought, oral communication competency, and public/presentational speaking. Specifically, the student will demonstrate knowledge and understanding through the following:

-Grade on Oral Final Exam (content)
-Outlines for Final Exam
-Participation in class discussion & use of course material in presentations.
-Lecture and recitation attendance (ascertained through (10) ten point pop quizzes)

B. BEHAVIORAL DOMAIN: (doing)

The student will be able to demonstrate ability to organize thoughts and use operational skills and communication behaviors and competencies necessary to communicate those organized thoughts to others in a public presentation. Specifically, the student will demonstrate knowledge and understanding through the following:

-Five outlines for speeches (12, 24, 36, 48, & 48 pts.)
-Five in-class presentations (24, 48, 72, 96, & 96 pts.)

C. AFFECTIVE DOMAIN: (feeling)

The student will be able to, and will demonstrate measurable improvement in, the willingness and motivation necessary to communicate organized thoughts to others in a public presentation. Specifically, the student will demonstrate knowledge and understanding through the following:

-Pre- and post-testing on speaking and listening competency, communication apprehension, and self esteem.
-Review of all five presentations in the laboratory.
-Observable commitment to course

goals.

D. ETHICAL DOMAIN:

The student will be able to demonstrate a defined personal set of ethics and values, in regard to communication competency, that takes responsibility for self, others, and relationships and outcomes, in communication interaction(s). Specifically, the student will demonstrate knowledge and understanding through the following:

-Statement of Personal Ethics

IV. Point Breakdown and Worksheet

NOTE: All speeches will be graded on a 72 pt. scale. However, each speech does not carry the same weight in this point system.

Assignment	Your Score	Possible Score
Introduction Speech (72 x .33)	_____	24
Information Speech (72 x .66)	_____	48
Information Speech Outline	_____	24
Documentative Speech (72 x 1)	_____	72
Documentative Speech Outline	_____	36
Persuasive Speech (72 x 1.33)	_____	96
Persuasive Speech Outline	_____	48
Oral Final Exam (72 x 1.33)	_____	96
Oral Final Exam Outline	_____	48
Five Add'l Final Exam Outlines	_____	100
Participation and Attendance in Lecture and Recitation	_____	100
Pre and Post Tests	_____	75
Review of all Five Presentations (___,___,___,___,___)	_____	75
Ethics Statement	_____	100
TOTAL POINTS	_____	942

V. GRADING SYSTEM (Based on Point Assignment System)

942 - 885 points	- A	677 - 641 points	- C
884 - 829 points	- A-	640 - 603 points	- C-
828 - 791 points	- B+	602 - 565 points	- D+
790 - 754 points	- B	564 - 528 points	- D
753 - 716 points	- B-	527 - 442 points	- D-
715 - 678 points	- C+		

VI. TEXTBOOK: Makay, John. (1992). Public Speaking: Theory into Practice. Harcourt, Brace, & Jovanovich